

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/796,783	03/09/2004	Hiroyasu Inoue	1324.70004	1676	
7590 01/13/2006		EXAMINER			
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Drive			QI, ZHI QIANG		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2871	÷	
Chicago, IL 6	50606		DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006	DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/796,783	INOUE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mike Qi	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realized to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED	I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 No.	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 November 2005</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 14-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14 and 16-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/16/04:	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/796,783

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 14 and 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,306,469 B1 (Serbutoviez et al) in view of US 5,969,781 (Matsuyama et al).

Regarding claim 14, Serbutoviez discloses (col.1, lines 15-46) that using a mixture such as a liquid crystalline material mixed with a reactive monomer as the liquid crystal layer to form the liquid crystal display panel so as to seal such material between two substrates, and then polymerizing this layer. Because the liquid crystal display molecules having different pre-tilt angle in any liquid crystal cell, so that polymerizing the reactive monomer to impart a different pre-tilt angle in part of the pixel region.

Serbutoviez does not explicitly disclose that the tilting liquid crystal molecules varies depending on part of the pixel region, and having a different threshold voltage in part of each pixel region.

Matsuyama discloses (Fig.6B) that the tilting liquid crystal molecules in part of a pixel region (15) of the liquid crystal panel varies depending on part of the pixel region such as the liquid crystal molecules (3a, 3b), and such tilt rapidly so that the display having rapid response (high speed of response). As a general available knowledge, small tilt angle would have higher speed response, and the different tilting areas having

obtain different domain and widen the viewing angle. Matsuyama indicates (col.4, line 56 – col.5, lije10) that such tilting within the pixel region (15) reduces view angle dependency so as to insure a desirable view angle characteristic.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display manufacturing method of Sebutoviez with the teachings of tilting the liquid crystal molecules varies as taught by Matsuyama, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for achieving a desirable view angle characteristic (col.4, line 56 – col.5, line10).

Regarding claims 16-18, Sebutoviez teaches the invention set forth above except for the liquid crystal display panel having an area with different cell thickness, different initial pre-tilt angle and different electric field direction.

Matsuyama discloses (Fig.6B) that in part of the pixel region (15) having an area with different cell thickness (as shown in Fig.6), with different initial pre-tile angle such as the molecules (3a, 3b), and with different electric field direction such as (E1, E3), and such tilting within the pixel region (15) reduces view angle dependency so as to insure a desirable view angle characteristic (col.4, line 56 – col.5, line10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display manufacturing method of Sebutoviez with the teachings of having an area with different cell thickness, different initial pre-tilt angle and different electric field direction as taught by Matsuyama, since

the skilled in the art would be motivated for achieving a desirable view angle characteristic (col.4, line 56 – col.5, line10).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior at of record neither discloses nor teaches that a liquid crystal manufacturing method comprises various steps, more specifically, as the following:

tilting the liquid crystal molecules in part of the pixel region comprises a step of applying a predetermine voltage that is a repetition of a high voltage and a low voltage to the liquid crystal at a frequency determined base on the speed of response [claim 15, as shown in Fig.34]

The closest reference such as Matsuyama shows (Fig.6B) a different tilt angle in part of a pixel region so as to reduce the view angle dependency. However, the prior art of record do not show that the tilting the liquid crystal molecules in part of the pixel region comprises a step of applying a predetermine voltage that is a repetition of a high voltage and a low voltage to the liquid crystal at a frequency determined base on the speed of response as claimed.

Application/Control Number: 10/796,783 Page 5

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Qi January 6, 2006

> ANDREW SCHECHTER PRIMARY EXAMINER